

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 being independent. Applicant herein amends claims 1, 6, 11, and 16. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least at paragraphs [0027]-[0033], [0044]-[0046], and [0049]. No new matter has been added.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0217166 to Dal Canto et al. (hereinafter “Dal Canto”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended as proposed during the interview and are believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 1, as presently amended, recites in part:

wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent files** that point to the one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being **stored on the client computing device** and

presented to the user through a **user interface (UI) shell** executing on the client computing device,

... the merged view being transparent of whether the applications are managed by different information sources across **multiple accessor modules** on the Intranet

... and wherein an accessor interrogates a directory service of the Intranet for **user specific resource data**, wherein the user specific resource data includes data directed to obtaining the network address for a user's computing device via a domain name service (DNS)

Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto fails to disclose the elements of independent claim 1 as presently amended.

Dal Canto fails to disclose each and every element of independent claim 1.

Dal Canto is directed to “remote access of digital data and services and, more particularly to a service provisioning system architecture for providing universal stateless digital and computer services.” (Dal Canto, page 1, para [0002]). The meta-desktop of Dal Canto is a top-level selection interface that is used to connect the client device to a particular digital communications service. (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]). Dal Canto describes the creation and display of a “meta-desktop” which is pushed to a client device, and includes advertising, branding, and other service-related functions along with icons representing various services available to an authenticated user. (Dal Canto, page 6, para [0047], page 7, para [0049]). “Preferably, the Meta-Desktop module 220 transmits, pushes or broadcasts dynamically changing and constantly updated displays to the client devices 400.” (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]).

However, Dal Canto fails to disclose “wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent files** that point to the one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being **stored on the client computing device** and presented to the user through a **user interface (UI) shell** executing on the client computing device, ... the merged view being transparent of whether the applications are managed by different information sources across **multiple accessor modules** on the Intranet ... and wherein an accessor interrogates a directory service of the Intranet for **user specific resource data**, wherein the user specific resource data includes data directed to obtaining the network address for a user’s computing device via a domain name service (DNS)” as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Dal Canto.

Dal Canto does not disclose Shortcuts

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office cites “icons 440” from paragraph [0049] of Dal Canto as allegedly describing the “shortcuts” recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. An icon is understood by one skilled in the art to describe a *picture* which *represents* an object or file, while a shortcut *is* an *object or file*, with much more functionality, which may be represented by an icon. Webopedia defines an icon as “[a] small picture that represents an object or program.” <http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/i/icon.html>. Webopedia then distinguishes a shortcut as

[a] special type of file in some operating systems that points to another file or device. You can place shortcuts on the desktop to conveniently access files that may be stored deep in the directory structure. Double-clicking the shortcut icon is the same as double-clicking the actual file.

You can control how a shortcut appears by naming it anything you want and associating a particular icon with it.

<http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/s/shortcut.html>. The specification at paragraph [0052] further describes some properties of shortcuts as “presented independent of their respective data sources, for instance, on a desktop of the remote computing device 106, [or] via a “start” menu...” (Specification, page 20, para [0052]).

Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto fails to disclose shortcuts as recited in independent claim 1, or in Applicant’s specification.

Therefore, Dal Canto fails to disclose each and every element of independent claim 1 as presently amended. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Dal Canto, and is allowable for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that each recites.

Independent claims 6, 11, and 16, as presently amended, recite in part:

wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent files** that point to the one or more respective applications

to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being **stored on the client computing device** and presented to the user through a **user interface (UI) shell** executing on the client computing device,

... the merged view being transparent of whether the applications are managed by different information sources across **multiple accessor modules** on the Intranet

... and wherein an accessor interrogates a directory service of the Intranet for **user specific resource data**, wherein the user specific resource data includes data directed to obtaining the network address for a user's computing device via a domain name service (DNS).

As discussed previously, Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto fails to disclose the elements of these independent claims as presently amended.

Dal Canto describes a meta-desktop selection interface that is used to connect a client device to a particular digital communications service. (Dal Canto, page 7, para [0049]). However, Dal Canto fails to disclose “wherein the one or more shortcuts are **independent files** that point to the one or more respective applications to which the user has TS based access, the independent files being **stored on the client computing device** and presented to the user through a **user interface (UI) shell** executing on the client computing device, ... the merged view being transparent of whether the applications are managed by different information sources across **multiple accessor modules** on the Intranet ... and wherein an accessor interrogates a directory service of the Intranet for **user specific resource data**, wherein the user specific resource data includes data

directed to obtaining the network address for a user's computing device via a domain name service (DNS)" as recited in independent claims 6, 11, and 16.

Therefore, Dal Canto fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 6, 11, and 16 as presently amended. Accordingly, independent claims 6, 11, and 16 are not anticipated by Dal Canto and are allowable for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 7-10 depend from independent claim 6, **Dependent claims 12-15** depend from independent claim 11, and **Dependent claims 17-20** depend from independent claim 16. Dependent claims 7-10, 12-15 and 17-20 include all of the features of the respective independent base claims. They are, therefore, allowable by virtue of this dependency as well as for additional features that each recites.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/s/ Patrick D.S. Reed Dated: 17 March 2008

Patrick D.S. Reed (patrick@leehayes.com; x252)
Registration No. 61,227
Christopher W. Lattin (christopher@leehayes.com; x263)
Registration No. 56,064
Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com